

1 Personnel received Appellant's appeal on December 21, 1998. The Director's determination was
2 issued on April 16, 1999 and concluded that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May
3 12, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals
4 Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding. In summary, Appellant takes
5 exception to the determination that she was not performing lead duties.

6
7 Appellant works in the deli of the Terry-Lander Cafeteria. In addition to the deli, the cafeteria
8 includes a grill and a hot table. Staffing in the cafeteria varies depending on the demand for food
9 services. In addition to Appellant, the deli is staffed, as needed, with temporary employees and/or
10 part-time student employees. When additional staff are needed in any area of the cafeteria,
11 including the deli, either the manager or the assistant manager determine where staff is needed and
12 then assigns staff to the appropriate area. When new staff is assigned to the deli, Appellant
13 provides on-the-job training and answers questions.

14
15 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant disagrees with DOP's determination that she was
16 not responsible for regularly assigning, instructing and checking the work of others. Appellant
17 argues that in addition to providing training to new employees, she oversees their work, tells them
18 when tasks need to be done, such as restocking ingredients needed for making sandwiches in the
19 deli, and corrects them when they make errors. Appellant contends that she works independently,
20 that she performs lead duties, and that her position should be reallocated.

21
22 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent concedes that Appellant works
23 independently. However, Respondent asserts that Appellant's position is not assigned lead
24 responsibilities. Respondent contends that she is assigned to direct the work of others consistent
25 with the Food Service Worker classification.

1 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly
2 allocated to the Food Service Worker classification should be affirmed.

3
4 **Relevant Classifications.** Food Service Worker, class code 4045, and Food Service Worker Lead,
5 class code 4046.

6
7 **Decision of the Board.** During the hearing on exceptions, both Appellant and Respondent
8 presented the Board with additional information regarding Appellant's responsibilities for providing
9 direction to other employees. Both parties argued that this information was clarification of
10 information already included in the record. However, a review of these documents shows that they
11 go beyond clarification of existing information. Rather, these documents appear to be offers of
12 proof of the parties respective arguments. This information should have been provided during the
13 Director's review. Nonetheless, we have reviewed the documents and have considered them in
14 making our decision.

15
16 The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall
17 duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume
18 of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a
19 position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A
20 position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the
21 available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best
22 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington
23 State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

24
25 The basic function for Food Service Worker Lead states, in relevant part: "[l]ead and participate in
26 the preparation and service of food. . . ." The distinguishing characteristics state, in relevant part:

1 “[r]egularly assign, instruct and check the work of others. . . .” WAC 251-01-255 defines the term
2 lead and clarifies that a lead worker is assigned lead responsibilities as a significant part of his or
3 her responsibilities.

4
5 The basic function for Food Service Worker states: “[p]erform routine work in preparing and
6 serving food and beverages and performing clean-up activities.” The distinguishing characteristics
7 state: “[u]nder direct supervision, perform a variety of duties in the preparation and serving of food
8 and in maintaining sanitary conditions of a food service operation.” In addition, the typical work
9 for this class includes: “[m]ay direct the work of student trainees and part-time help.” The Higher
10 Education Glossary of Terms provides that employees who direct the work of others provide work
11 guidance or direction but are not responsible for assigning, instructing and checking the work of
12 others on a regular and ongoing basis.

13
14 Appellant does not assign employees to their respective work areas nor does she, on a regular and
15 ongoing basis, instruct or check the work of others as a significant part of her responsibilities.
16 However, she does provide guidance and direction to employees assigned to the deli. Therefore,
17 Appellant’s responsibility for other staff is best described as directing rather than leading their
18 work. Appellant’s level of responsibility for other employees is described by the Food Service
19 Worker classification.

20
21 When performing the duties of her position, Appellant adheres to specific food preparation
22 guidelines. By utilizing these guidelines, she performs the duties of her position independently and
23 with little supervision. The level of supervision provided to Appellant is best described as general
24 rather than direct. However, the level of supervision Appellant receives does not justify
25 reallocation of her position to a lead classification. Before Appellant’s position can be allocated to
26 the lead classification, she must perform lead work.

1
2 As stated above, the purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes
3 the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. In this case, the focus of Appellant's position is
4 to prepare food and to provide customer service to patrons of the deli. Appellant's duties and
5 responsibilities are best described by the Food Service Worker classification.

6
7 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
8 determination dated April 16, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

9
10 **ORDER**

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
12 denied and the Director's determination dated April 16, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is
13 attached.

14 DATED this _____ day of _____, 1999.

15 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

16
17 _____
18 Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

19
20 _____
21 Nathan S. Ford Jr., Member

22
23
24
25
26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504